

point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 237, nays 188, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No 798]

YEAS—237

Allard	Frelinghuysen	Molinari
Archer	Frisa	Moorhead
Arney	Funderburk	Morella
Bachus	Galleghy	Murtha
Baker (CA)	Ganske	Myers
Baker (LA)	Gekas	Myrick
Ballenger	Geren	Nethercutt
Barr	Gilchrest	Neumann
Barrett (NE)	Gillmor	Ney
Bartlett	Gilman	Norwood
Barton	Goodlatte	Nussle
Bass	Goodling	Oxley
Bateman	Goss	Packard
Bereuter	Graham	Parker
Bevill	Greenwood	Paxon
Bilbray	Gunderson	Petri
Bilirakis	Gutknecht	Pombo
Bishop	Hall (TX)	Porter
Bliley	Hancock	Portman
Blute	Hansen	Pryce
Boehlert	Hastert	Quillen
Boehner	Hastings (WA)	Quinn
Bonilla	Hayes	Radanovich
Bono	Hayworth	Ramstad
Brewster	Hefley	Regula
Browder	Heineman	Riggs
Brownback	Herger	Roberts
Bryant (TN)	Hilleary	Rogers
Bunn	Hobson	Rohrabacher
Bunning	Hoekstra	Ros-Lehtinen
Burr	Hoke	Roth
Burton	Horn	Roukema
Buyer	Hostettler	Royce
Callahan	Hunter	Salmon
Calvert	Hutchinson	Sanford
Camp	Hyde	Saxton
Canady	Inglis	Scarborough
Castle	Istook	Schaefer
Chabot	Johnson (CT)	Schiff
Chambliss	Johnson, Sam	Seastrand
Christensen	Jones	Sensenbrenner
Chrysler	Kasich	Shadegg
Clinger	Kelly	Shaw
Coble	Kim	Shays
Collins (GA)	King	Shuster
Combest	Kingston	Skeen
Cooley	Klink	Smith (MI)
Cox	Klug	Smith (NJ)
Crane	Knollenberg	Smith (TX)
Crapo	Kolbe	Smith (WA)
Cremeans	LaHood	Solomon
Cunningham	Largent	Souder
Davis	Latham	Stearns
Deal	LaTourette	Stenholm
DeLay	Laughlin	Stockman
Diaz-Balart	Lazio	Talent
Dickey	Leach	Tate
Dicks	Lewis (CA)	Tauzin
Doolittle	Lewis (KY)	Taylor (NC)
Dornan	Lightfoot	Thomas
Dreier	Linder	Thornberry
Duncan	Livingston	Torkildsen
Dunn	LoBiondo	Trafficant
Ehlers	Longley	Upton
Ehrlich	Lucas	Vucanovich
Emerson	Manzullo	Walker
English	Martini	Walsh
Ensign	McCollum	Wamp
Everett	McCrery	Watts (OK)
Ewing	McDade	Weldon (FL)
Fawell	McHugh	Weldon (PA)
Fields (TX)	McInnis	Weller
Flanagan	McIntosh	White
Foley	McKeon	Whitfield
Forbes	Meehan	Wicker
Fowler	Metcalf	Wolf
Fox	Meyers	Young (FL)
Franks (CT)	Mica	Zeliff
Franks (NJ)	Miller (FL)	Zimmer

NAYS—188

Abercrombie	Baesler	Barrett (WI)
Ackerman	Baldacci	Becerra
Andrews	Barcia	Beilenson

Bentsen	Hamilton	Pastor
Berman	Harman	Payne (NJ)
Bonior	Hastings (FL)	Payne (VA)
Borski	Hefner	Pelosi
Boucher	Hilliard	Peterson (FL)
Brown (CA)	Hinchey	Peterson (MN)
Brown (FL)	Holden	Pickett
Brown (OH)	Hoyer	Pomeroy
Bryant (TX)	Jackson-Lee	Poshard
Cardin	Jacobs	Rahall
Chapman	Jefferson	Rangel
Chenoweth	Johnson (SD)	Reed
Clay	Johnson, E. B.	Richardson
Clayton	Johnston	Rivers
Clement	Kanjorski	Roemer
Clyburn	Kaptur	Rose
Coburn	Kennedy (MA)	Roybal-Allard
Coleman	Kennedy (RI)	Rush
Collins (IL)	Kennelly	Sabo
Collins (MI)	Kildee	Sanders
Condit	Kleccka	Sawyer
Conyers	LaFalce	Schroeder
Costello	Lantos	Schumer
Coyne	Levin	Scott
Cramer	Lewis (GA)	Serrano
Cubin	Lincoln	Sisisky
Danner	Lipinski	Skaggs
de la Garza	Lofgren	Skelton
DeFazio	Lowe	Slaughter
DeLauro	Luther	Spratt
Dellums	Maloney	Stark
Deutsch	Manton	Stokes
Dingell	Markey	Studds
Dixon	Martinez	Stump
Doggett	Mascara	Stupak
Dooley	Matsui	Tanner
Doyle	McCarthy	Taylor (MS)
Durbin	McDermott	Thompson
Edwards	McHale	Thornton
Engel	McKinney	Thurman
Eshoo	McNulty	Tiahrt
Evans	Meek	Torres
Farr	Menendez	Torricelli
Fattah	Mfume	Towns
Fazio	Miller (CA)	Velazquez
Filner	Minge	Vento
Flake	Mink	Visclosky
Foglietta	Moakley	Volkmer
Ford	Mollohan	Ward
Frank (MA)	Montgomery	Waters
Frost	Moran	Watt (NC)
Furse	Nadler	Waxman
Gejdenson	Neal	Williams
Gephardt	Oberstar	Wilson
Gibbons	Obey	Wise
Gonzalez	Olver	Woolsey
Gordon	Ortiz	Wyden
Green	Orton	Wynn
Gutierrez	Owens	Yates
Hall (OH)	Pallone	

NOT VOTING—7

Fields (LA)	Tejeda	Young (AK)
Houghton	Tucker	
Spence	Waldholtz	

□ 1602

Mr. MORAN and Mr. STUMP changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE RESOLUTION 250, THE HOUSE GIFT REFORM RULE

Ms. PRYCE, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104-341) on the resolution (H. Res. 268) providing for consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 250) to amend the Rules of the House of Representatives to provide for gift reform, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2564, LOBBYING DISCLOSURE ACT OF 1995

Ms. PRYCE, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 104-342) on the resolution (H. Res. 269) providing for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 2564) to provide for the disclosure of lobbying activities to influence the Federal Government, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 1977, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 1996

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 253, I call up the conference report on the bill (H.R. 1977) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 1996, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BURTON). Pursuant to rule XXVIII, the conference report is considered read.

(For conference report and statement, see proceedings of the House of October 31, 1995, at page H11541.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA] will be recognized for 30 minutes, and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] will be recognized for 30 minutes.

It is the Chair's understanding that the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SKAGGS] will control the time on the Democratic side.

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Speaker, that is correct. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that 5 minutes of the time that the minority would otherwise control be controlled by the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT].

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA].

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the conference report to H.R. 1977, which was just agreed to, and that I be allowed to include extraneous and tabular material.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I bring to you today the improved and revised Interior conference report. When we last met on H.R. 1977, the House voted to recommit the Interior Appropriations conference agreement with instructions to restore

the mining patent moratorium included in the House-passed bill.

As the original author of the patent moratorium which was enacted for the first time last year, I supported the motion to recommit. Mr. Speaker, I urge those who joined me in supporting that motion, and all of my colleagues, to support this conference agreement and defeat a new motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, I will discuss that at a little more length. The Interior Appropriations conference agreement is fair. It is a well-balanced bill. It is fiscally responsible. It cuts spending by 10 percent from last year's level. It is sensitive to the need to preserve and enhance our natural and cultural resources.

It keeps open the facilities that are important to the public. We level-fund the money for the operations of the parks. We level-fund the money for the operations of the Forest Service, or close to it, so that they can provide the facilities that people enjoy. It is the same with other agencies; the Smithsonian, the National Gallery, the Kennedy Center.

Mr. Speaker, I want to address essentially the two issues that we will hear a lot about today. It is my understanding there will be a motion to recommit this bill back to the conference committee for further revision of the mining moratorium and the Tongass language.

Mr. Speaker, let me say to my colleagues, if reforming the 1872 mining law were easy, it would have been accomplished years ago, and certainly would have been accomplished in the past 2 years, 1993, and 1994, when my friends from the other side of the aisle had complete control.

Mr. Speaker, they had control of the House. They had control of the Senate. They had the President, the executive branch, as a Member of their party. So, for 2 years they had a golden opportunity to revise the 1872 Mining Law. Nothing happened.

The only thing that was done in that period of time was a moratorium on issuing patents, which was language I introduced into the Interior appropriations bill.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REGULA. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is fully aware that under the last Congress, we passed overwhelmingly out of the House of Representatives a bill that was true mining law reform.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I agree, and I supported the bill.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would continue to yield, I appreciate all of the gentleman's efforts, but to imply that under the last majority in this Congress we did not do anything is not a correct statement.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, again reclaiming my time, I apologize for the

misunderstanding. What I meant was nothing was done in terms of legislation being enacted into law and signed by the President to change the 1872 mining law. I think the gentleman from West Virginia would agree that is the case.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would continue to yield, as the gentleman just then stated it, that is correct. But we did pass true mining law reform out of this body.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, the gentleman from West Virginia was a sponsor and it was a good bill and I spoke for it and supported it. Unfortunately, it died in conference and it did not get to the President.

But, Mr. Speaker, the point I am making is that it is very difficult to revise the 1872 mining law. I think the gentleman from West Virginia would agree with that, because the gentleman has been making an effort for several years to accomplish that goal.

What concerns me is that this bill is being used to address that problem. We have heard speeches during the rule debate that would indicate that we are not doing mining reform. That is not the mission of this bill. That is not the venue of this bill. Mining reform is in the reconciliation bill. Members who want mining reform, including myself, should push hard to get the reconciliation bill to have meaningful mining reform.

Mr. Speaker, what we are doing is stopping the issuance of patents. We are stopping the giveaway. We responded in the second conference to the directive of the motion to recommit offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES], my good friend and the ranking member of this committee and former chairman. Mr. Speaker, I agreed with him. I voted to recommit. We went back to the conference and it was a struggle with the other body, but we got a mining moratorium. It stops the giveaway.

Of course, it provides that if a reconciliation bill contains meaningful mining reform, if it is signed by the President and becomes the law of the land, then the mining moratorium drops out. That is only fair. But I think, and I emphasize over and over again, we did what we were instructed to do. We have a moratorium on the issuance of mining patents.

Certainly some are grandfathered, because they are in the pipeline. This was true in the language last year. We made every effort in this bill to address the mining question insofar as it is our responsibility.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that in the discussion that follows, that we will not be discussing the reconciliation bill, but rather we will be discussing what we do, which is to stop the issuance of patents until such time as a meaningful mining reform bill is signed by the President.

Of course, this would be in effect until the end of the fiscal year 1996.

The other issue will be the Tongass, and I would again, as I did in the rule debate, point out that the Tongass language is subject to a decision on the part of the Forest Service, by the chief, because it says that any increase in the cut must be to the extent practicable as determined by the chief of the Forest Service.

Mr. Speaker, that means that the administration of my friends on the other side of the aisle will be calling the shots on anything that will be done in the Tongass. I would point out that in the Tongass, there are 17 million acres. A great part of that acreage is already set aside as wilderness.

If my colleagues will look at the chart here, in the Tongass, almost 7 million acres out of the 17 is wilderness. Not even hunting and fishing. It is no cutting of timber certainly. No cutting.

Another 4.6 million acres is set aside for recreation, and the nonsuitable timber is 4 million. That leaves 1.7 million out of a total of 17 million acres, or 10 percent as a timber base.

Mr. Speaker, I would point out that, under the present program enacted by this body, will be harvested over the next 220 years.

□ 1615

So it is not going to impact on the Tongass. Furthermore, the cut that is already allowed by legislation passed last year when my good friend was chairman of the committee allows a cut of 310 million board feet. Under the language that is put in the conference report, it might increase to 320. It probably will not increase at all. We would be cutting the same amount that was allocated for 1995.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REGULA. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, under the language of alternative P, the amount is raised to 410 million board feet; is that not correct?

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, that is correct.

Mr. YATES. In conversation with officials of the Forest Service, I was told that there is no way, no way they can be forced not to cut 410 million board feet because the Alaska delegation is so insistent upon their doing so.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I can only say that one of the members of the Forest Service who worked in the Tongass said that, as a practical matter, there will be no increase in cut over what is allocated. As a practical matter, there is no money to do it, regardless of what the Alaska delegation may want to do. We did not put enough money in, which I agreed with, and I am sure the gentleman from Illinois agreed with, to accomplish a 310 million board foot timber harvest.

So actually the Tongass language for all practical purposes has no effect. I think that to send this back to conference on those issues does not make

sense. We have taken care of the mining moratorium as we were directed to in the original motion to recommit. As far as the Tongass is concerned, the language was in the bill, in the bill when we sent it back to conference, and nobody mentioned it. Now, suddenly this is brought up.

I assume that, if we would go back to conference, make some changes here, then there would be something else that would not suit. We have to get on with this because if we can pass this bill, the parks will open. That is the problem. Let us get this bill down to the President and open the parks and the Washington Monument and the Smithsonian and the Kennedy Center and the National Gallery. All we need to do to open those facilities is to pass this bill and send it to the President and have him sign it. Let us do that. That is what the public wants. Let us deal with those issues.

Let the reconciliation bill deal with mining reform. For those that do not like what is in that bill, that is the venue that should be addressed. Those that do not like mining reform language as it is set forth in reconciliation should vote against it. They should object to it. They should speak on that issue. This is not the place for mining reform. We are doing the best we can to stop the giving away of the land by putting a moratorium in. That is the extent of what our right is under this bill.

I am not going to take a lot of time on the other features in the bill. I think we have done a good job working with the Members on both sides of the aisle to have a fair, balanced budget. I think they would agree that it was not in any way partisan. We did the projects. We dealt with the things that were important and we keep the facilities open. If we can get this bill down to the President, we can get the parks opened again and give the public access that they deserve.

I would certainly say to my colleagues, and I guess I begin to sound like a broken record, but let me say over and over again, this conference report has a mining patent moratorium as was directed by this body in the motion to recommit. The Tongass language does very little. That is not a problem. The Forest Service says it is not a problem, and certainly I would accept their judgment on that. It was not a problem the last time we had a conference report here.

Suddenly for some reason it came up here. All I can say is, I think that this is a reasonable bill. We have done our best to address the problems. I hope in this debate we will limit our remarks to what is in the bill.

I kept thinking when I listened to the comments on the rule, this must be the reconciliation bill, because most of the speeches were directed to the reconciliation bill, which has mining reform, or to other items that were in that bill and not to this bill. We heard about the Bureau of Indian Affairs and

education. We increase tribal education over last year. We flat fund the health services. Those are the two most important things.

Obviously, when you have 10 percent less than we had in 1995, to work with, it is difficult. We had to work hard to make sure that all the essential services, all the essential programs were funded. And some of the things that it would be nice to do simply could not be done under those circumstances. But I have to say, I believe that in November 1994, the American people said we want the budget balanced in an appropriate time. We want to reduce spending, and we have made every effort to accomplish that goal; in the process, not do anything that is injurious to the management and the use of the 750 million acres of America that are presently owned by the Federal Government and to the other programs that are funded by this bill.

I urge all of my colleagues to reject the motion to recommit and vote for the bill. Let us get on with this. Let us get those parks open so that the public can again enjoy the parks and the forest and the fish and wildlife facilities and the Smithsonian and the Kennedy Center, the National Gallery and all the other good things that we fund.

The bill is 10 percent, or \$1.4 billion below 1995 spending levels. This represents real savings both now and in the future. By not starting programs or construction we save costs in future years. The bill terminates agencies and programs and puts others on notice that Federal funding will terminate in the near future. This bill is not business as usual. We are not cutting at the margins with the hopes that if we can keep programs on life support more money will be available in the future. Instead we have terminated lower priority initiatives to provide scarce resources to meet the many critical needs of our public lands, to ensure quality health and education for native Americans and to promote quality science and research in energy and public land management.

Specifically four agencies were eliminated: the National Biological Service, the Bureau of Mines, DOE's Office of Emergency Preparedness, and the Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation. In addition more than 35 individual programs have been eliminated.

With respect to the National Biological Service, an issue of some interest to many in this body, let me reiterate the NBS has been eliminated. However, as many agreed, the core natural resource research activities critical to responsible stewardship of our public lands has been preserved and will be carried out by what is widely recognized as a premier unbiased, credible scientific agency, the U.S. Geological Survey. As the statement of the managers makes clear, this merger is permanent and is to be fully implemented by October 1, 1996. This will ensure that critical research continue and that it

be conducted independent of regulatory influence or agendas and will ensure scientific excellence. I will also commit to my colleagues that have had a keen interest in this issue that I intend to very closely monitor the elimination of the NBS and the absorption of the core scientific functions into the USGS to ensure that the intent of the conferees is met. In keeping with our commitment to reduce spending we have also cut funding for this activity by 15 percent.

The National Endowment for the Arts is funded at the House-passed level of \$99.5 million and the statement of the managers makes it clear that it is the intent of the House to terminate Federal support for the NEA after fiscal year 1997.

Funding for land acquisition, as in the House-passed bill, is not earmarked and is funded at 40 percent below past year's funding levels, ensuring that limited funding will be directed to high priority projects for the four land management agencies.

Contrary to what you may have read in your local press, passage of this bill will not force the closure of one single National Park. No park will be forced to close under this agreement as funding for park operations is over 1995 levels by \$5 million. To achieve that increase savings were made in lower priority park programs such as land acquisition and construction. Construction has been reduced more than 14 percent and land acquisition is down nearly 44 percent. Overall, however, funding for the Park Service is down less than 5 percent.

Further the bill establishes a new Recreational Fee Demonstration Program that may help land managers meet their growing needs by collecting fees which can then be used in the areas in which they are generated for enhancements and improvements in sites, facilities, interpretive programs and so forth, all needs which we cannot fully meet with declining budgets.

Generally we have tried to fund critical maintenance and as much as possible, health and safety needs.

Funding for critical scientific research is also maintained including important health and safety research and mineral assessments of the former Bureau of Mines which will now be carried out by the USGS and the Department of Energy for significant savings. This disposition upholds the House position that much of the work of the Bureau in health and safety research and minerals information is critical and these functions will be preserved.

Core programs that are critical to providing for the needs of native Americans have also been maintained. Funding for the Indian Health Service is down less than one percent from last year's level. Of the increase above the Senate level virtually all of this was directed to the tribal priority allocations which all the tribes indicated was the highest priority for restoration.

Energy programs have also been reduced ten percent from 1995 levels with

commitments for continued downward trends. Numerous energy projects were terminated and limited funding focused on projects and programs which leverage significant non-Federal investment.

While new construction was significantly curtailed it was our goal to take care of necessary maintenance and rehabilitation of Federal facilities and the Smithsonian is a good example where the conference provides nearly \$34 million, the budget request, for critical repair and restoration of aging Smithsonian facilities.

Two points of clarification: First, in the statement of the Managers accompanying the conference report the managers referred to the "existing hospital authority" in American Samoa. This reference is to the institutional entity, and does not preclude charges to the composition or the structuring of the

authority, particularly if the changes strengthen the management of health care in American Samoa; and second, the managers for both the House and the Senate agree that funds provided in this bill for cooperative conservation agreements may be used for the 4(d) rule to ease endangered species land use restriction on landowners, whether large or small.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REGULA. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, will the public be able to do that if the President vetoes the bill as he said he was going to do?

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, obviously, if the President vetoes the bill, we will not be able to do it, but I think we ought to give him a chance to make a decision. As it is, he cannot even ad-

dress the issue. If he does veto the bill and sends it back, at least we will know through that what his concerns are. I think in terms of an orderly procedure, let us do that. Then if he is not satisfied, we will know and we can address that by further action of our appropriate committees.

In conclusion I would urge my colleagues to support this bill. It is fiscally responsible and it meets the concerns of my colleagues who voted a month ago for reconsideration with respect to the mining patent moratorium.

At this point I ask that a table detailing the various amounts in the bill as agreed to by the conference managers be included in the RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the following material:

FY 1996 INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 1977)

	FY 1995 Enacted	FY 1996 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
TITLE I - DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR						
Bureau of Land Management						
Management of lands and resources	597,236,000	616,547,000	570,017,000	563,936,000	566,082,000	-29,174,000
Fire protection	114,748,000	114,763,000	-114,748,000
Emergency Department of the Interior firefighting fund	121,176,000	131,482,000	-121,176,000
Wildland fire management	235,924,000	240,159,000	235,924,000	+235,924,000
Central hazard account	13,409,000	14,024,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	10,000,000	-3,409,000
Construction and access	12,086,000	3,019,000	2,515,000	2,615,000	3,115,000	-8,953,000
Payments in lieu of taxes	101,409,000	113,911,000	111,409,000	100,000,000	101,800,000	+81,000
Land acquisition	14,757,000	24,473,000	6,800,000	10,550,000	12,800,000	-1,957,000
Oregon and California grant lands	97,364,000	112,752,000	91,367,000	95,364,000	93,379,000	-3,985,000
Range improvements (indefinite)	10,350,000	9,113,000	9,113,000	9,113,000	9,113,000	-1,237,000
Service charges, deposits, and forfeitures (indefinite)	8,883,000	8,883,000	8,883,000	8,883,000	8,883,000	+110,000
Miscellaneous trust funds (indefinite)	7,805,000	7,805,000	7,805,000	7,805,000	7,805,000
Total, Bureau of Land Management	1,099,005,000	1,156,882,000	1,055,463,000	1,048,335,000	1,050,491,000	-48,514,000
United States Fish and Wildlife Service						
Resource management	511,334,000	535,018,000	497,150,000	501,478,000	497,943,000	-13,391,000
Construction	53,768,000	34,065,000	26,358,000	38,775,000	37,855,000	-19,113,000
Natural resource damage assessment and restoration fund	8,687,000	6,700,000	6,019,000	4,000,000	4,000,000	-2,687,000
Land acquisition	67,141,000	62,912,000	14,100,000	32,031,000	36,800,000	-30,241,000
Cooperative endangered species conservation fund	8,983,000	38,000,000	8,085,000	8,085,000	8,085,000	-898,000
National wildlife refuge fund	11,977,000	11,371,000	10,779,000	10,779,000	10,779,000	-1,198,000
Rewards and operations	1,167,000	1,169,000	800,000	800,000	800,000	-567,000
North American wetlands conservation fund	8,983,000	12,000,000	4,800,000	6,750,000	6,750,000	-2,233,000
Lahontan Valley and Pyramid Lake fish and wildlife fund	152,000	152,000	152,000	152,000	+152,000
Rhinoceros and tiger conservation fund	400,000	200,000	200,000	200,000	+200,000
Wildlife conservation and appreciation fund	998,000	1,000,000	998,000	800,000	800,000	-198,000
Total, United States Fish and Wildlife Service	671,036,000	702,817,000	568,936,000	603,950,000	603,984,000	-67,174,000
Natural Resources Science Agency						
Research, inventories, and surveys	162,041,000	172,696,000	145,965,000	-162,041,000
National Park Service						
Operation of the national park system	1,077,900,000	1,157,736,000	1,068,248,000	1,082,265,000	1,083,151,000	+5,251,000
National recreation and preservation	42,941,000	39,305,000	35,725,000	38,064,000	37,846,000	-5,292,000
Historic preservation fund	41,421,000	43,000,000	37,934,000	38,312,000	38,212,000	-5,209,000
Construction	167,896,000	179,883,000	114,898,000	116,460,000	143,225,000	-24,483,000
Urban park and recreation fund	8,000	2,300,000	-8,000
Land and water conservation fund (recession of contract authority)	-30,000,000	-30,000,000	-30,000,000	-30,000,000	-30,000,000
Land acquisition and state assistance	67,373,000	82,986,000	14,300,000	45,187,000	46,100,000	-38,273,000
Crime Trust Fund	15,200,000
Total, National Park Service (net)	1,367,329,000	1,480,122,000	1,281,078,000	1,300,338,000	1,318,387,000	-67,992,000
United States Geological Survey						
Surveys, investigations, and research	571,482,000	586,399,000	686,944,000	577,503,000	730,503,000	+159,041,000
Minerals Management Service						
Royalty and offshore minerals management	188,181,000	193,348,000	188,558,000	182,169,000	182,984,000	-5,187,000
Oil spill research	6,440,000	7,892,000	6,440,000	6,440,000	6,440,000
Total, Minerals Management Service	194,621,000	201,240,000	192,998,000	188,609,000	189,434,000	-5,187,000
Bureau of Mines						
Mines and minerals	152,427,000	132,507,000	67,000,000	126,007,000	64,000,000	-88,427,000
Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement						
Regulation and technology	109,795,000	107,152,000	92,751,000	95,470,000	95,470,000	-14,325,000
Receipts from performance bond forfeitures (indefinite)	1,186,000	501,000	500,000	500,000	500,000	-686,000
Subtotal	110,984,000	107,653,000	93,251,000	95,970,000	95,970,000	-15,014,000
Abandoned mine reclamation fund (definite, trust fund)	182,423,000	185,120,000	176,327,000	170,441,000	173,887,000	-8,536,000
Total, Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement	293,407,000	292,773,000	269,578,000	266,411,000	269,857,000	-23,550,000

FY 1996 INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 1977) — continued

	FY 1995 Enacted	FY 1996 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
Bureau of Indian Affairs						
Operation of Indian programs.....	1,519,012,000	1,609,842,000	1,509,828,000	1,281,234,000	1,359,434,000	-159,578,000
Construction.....	120,450,000	125,424,000	98,033,000	107,333,000	100,833,000	-19,617,000
Indian land and water claim settlements and miscellaneous payments to Indians.....	77,096,000	151,025,000	75,145,000	82,745,000	80,845,000	+3,549,000
Navajo rehabilitation trust fund.....	1,998,000					-1,998,000
Technical assistance of Indian enterprises.....	1,988,000	1,988,000		900,000	500,000	-1,488,000
Indian direct loan program account.....	779,000					-779,000
(Limitation on direct loans).....	(10,890,000)					(-10,890,000)
Indian guaranteed loan program account.....	9,871,000	9,984,000		7,700,000	5,000,000	-4,871,000
(Limitation on guaranteed loans).....	(46,900,000)	(70,100,000)		(50,880,000)	(35,914,000)	(-10,986,000)
Total, Bureau of Indian Affairs.....	1,730,970,000	1,897,941,000	1,682,806,000	1,459,912,000	1,546,412,000	-184,558,000
Territorial and International Affairs						
Assistance to territories.....	50,481,000	41,512,000	24,885,000	40,488,000	37,488,000	-13,013,000
Northern Mariana Islands Covenant.....	27,720,000	27,720,000	27,720,000	27,720,000	27,720,000	
Subtotal.....	78,201,000	69,232,000	52,405,000	68,188,000	65,188,000	-13,013,000
Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands.....	19,800,000					-19,800,000
Compact of Free Association.....	13,574,000	10,038,000	14,818,000	10,038,000	10,038,000	-3,538,000
Mandatory payments.....	10,000,000	14,800,000	14,800,000	14,800,000	14,800,000	+4,800,000
Subtotal.....	23,574,000	24,838,000	29,518,000	24,838,000	24,838,000	+1,364,000
Total, Territorial and International Affairs.....	121,575,000	94,170,000	81,923,000	93,126,000	90,126,000	-31,449,000
Departmental Offices						
Departmental management.....	62,479,000	64,772,000	53,919,000	57,796,000	57,796,000	-4,883,000
Office of the Solicitor.....	34,808,000	35,381,000	34,808,000	34,808,000	34,808,000	
Office of Inspector General.....	23,939,000	25,485,000	23,939,000	23,939,000	23,939,000	
Construction Management.....	1,988,000	2,000,000		500,000	500,000	-1,488,000
National Indian Gaming Commission.....	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	1,000,000	
Office of Special Trustee for American Indians.....				16,336,000	16,336,000	+16,336,000
Total, Departmental Offices.....	124,022,000	128,618,000	113,466,000	134,181,000	134,181,000	+10,159,000
Total, Title I, Department of the Interior:						
New budget (obligational) authority (net).....	6,507,997,000	6,865,935,000	6,000,180,000	5,946,037,000	5,998,205,000	-508,892,000
Appropriations.....	(6,537,997,000)	(6,870,735,000)	(6,030,180,000)	(5,976,037,000)	(6,028,205,000)	(-508,892,000)
Recession.....	(-30,000,000)	(-30,000,000)	(-30,000,000)	(-30,000,000)	(-30,000,000)	
Crime trust fund.....		(15,200,000)				
(Limitation on direct loans).....	(10,890,000)					(-10,890,000)
(Limitation on guaranteed loans).....	(46,900,000)	(70,100,000)		(50,880,000)	(35,914,000)	(-10,986,000)
TITLE II - RELATED AGENCIES						
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE						
Forest Service						
Forest research.....	193,748,000	203,796,000	182,000,000	177,000,000	178,000,000	-15,748,000
State and private forestry.....	154,288,000	187,456,000	128,551,000	136,794,000	136,794,000	-17,474,000
Emergency pest suppression fund.....	17,000,000					-17,000,000
International forestry.....	4,987,000	10,000,000				-4,987,000
National forest system.....	1,328,283,000	1,348,755,000	1,298,688,000	1,247,543,000	1,256,253,000	-72,840,000
Forest Service fire protection.....	159,285,000	164,285,000				-159,285,000
Emergency Forest Service firefighting fund.....	226,200,000	238,000,000				-226,200,000
Emergency appropriations.....	450,000,000					-450,000,000
Wildland Fire Management.....			385,485,000	381,485,000	385,485,000	+385,485,000
Construction.....	199,215,000	192,336,000	120,000,000	186,888,000	183,593,000	-36,715,000
Timber receipts transfer to general fund (indefinite).....	(-44,789,000)	(-44,548,000)	(-44,548,000)	(-44,548,000)	(-44,548,000)	(+221,000)
Timber purchaser credits.....	(50,000,000)	(50,000,000)	(50,000,000)	(50,000,000)	(50,000,000)	
Land acquisition.....	63,882,000	85,311,000	14,800,000	41,187,000	41,200,000	-22,882,000
Acquisition of lands for national forests, special acts.....	1,250,000	1,317,000	1,089,000	1,089,000	1,089,000	-181,000
Acquisition of lands to complete land exchanges (indefinite).....	210,000	210,000	210,000	210,000	210,000	
Range betterment fund (indefinite).....	4,575,000	3,976,000	3,976,000	3,976,000	3,976,000	-599,000
Gifts, donations and bequests for forest and rangeland research.....	89,000	92,000	92,000	92,000	92,000	+3,000
Total, Forest Service.....	2,803,602,000	2,416,539,000	2,103,871,000	2,176,224,000	2,186,579,000	-637,023,000
DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY						
Clean coal technology.....	-337,879,000	-155,019,000				+337,879,000
Fossil energy research and development.....	423,701,000	438,368,000	378,824,000	378,181,000	417,168,000	-8,532,000
(By transfer).....	(17,000,000)					(-17,000,000)
Alternative fuels production (indefinite).....	-3,900,000	-2,400,000	-2,400,000	-2,400,000	-2,400,000	+1,500,000
Naval petroleum and oil shale reserves.....	187,048,000	101,028,000	151,028,000	138,028,000	148,788,000	-36,282,000
Energy conservation.....	756,781,000	823,581,000	558,371,000	578,978,000	583,283,000	-202,458,000
Biomass Energy Development (transfer).....		-18,000,000	-18,000,000	-18,000,000	-18,000,000	-18,000,000

FY 1996 INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 1977) — continued

	FY 1995 Enacted	FY 1996 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
Economic regulation.....	12,413,000	10,500,000	6,287,000	8,038,000	6,287,000	-6,116,000
Emergency preparedness.....	8,233,000	8,219,000	-8,233,000
Strategic Petroleum Reserve.....	135,854,000	25,889,000	-135,854,000
(By transfer).....	(90,784,000)	(187,000,000)	(187,000,000)	(187,000,000)	(187,000,000)	(+86,236,000)
Energy Information Administration.....	84,588,000	84,889,000	78,788,000	84,788,000	72,388,000	-12,300,000
Total, Department of Energy.....	1,285,887,000	1,418,775,000	1,154,588,000	1,143,588,000	1,179,411,000	-88,478,000
DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES						
Indian Health Service						
Indian health services.....	1,709,780,000	1,818,350,000	1,725,782,000	1,815,373,000	1,722,842,000	+13,082,000
Indian health facilities.....	253,282,000	242,872,000	238,975,000	151,227,000	238,956,000	-14,324,000
Total, Indian Health Service.....	1,963,062,000	2,059,022,000	1,962,787,000	1,966,800,000	1,961,800,000	-1,282,000
DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION						
Office of Elementary and Secondary Education						
Indian education.....	81,341,000	84,785,000	52,500,000	54,880,000	52,500,000	-28,841,000
OTHER RELATED AGENCIES						
Office of Navajo and Hopi Indian Relocation						
Salaries and expenses.....	24,888,000	26,345,000	21,345,000	20,345,000	20,348,000	-4,543,000
Institute of American Indian and Alaska Native Culture and Arts Development						
Payment to the Institute.....	11,213,000	19,846,000	5,500,000	5,500,000	5,500,000	-5,713,000
Smithsonian Institution						
Salaries and expenses.....	313,853,000	329,800,000	308,471,000	307,988,000	308,188,000	-5,865,000
Construction and improvements, National Zoological Park.....	3,042,000	4,950,000	3,000,000	3,250,000	3,250,000	+208,000
Repair and restoration of buildings.....	23,854,000	34,000,000	24,854,000	33,854,000	33,854,000	+10,000,000
Construction.....	21,857,000	38,700,000	12,880,000	27,700,000	27,700,000	+5,843,000
Total, Smithsonian Institution.....	382,708,000	407,450,000	350,375,000	372,892,000	373,082,000	+10,388,000
National Gallery of Art						
Salaries and expenses.....	52,802,000	54,588,000	51,315,000	51,844,000	51,844,000	-1,058,000
Repair, restoration and renovation of buildings.....	4,016,000	9,885,000	5,500,000	7,385,000	8,442,000	+2,438,000
Total, National Gallery of Art.....	56,818,000	64,481,000	56,815,000	59,229,000	59,286,000	+1,388,000
John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts						
Operations and maintenance.....	10,323,000	10,373,000	9,300,000	10,323,000	10,323,000
Construction.....	8,983,000	9,000,000	8,983,000	8,983,000	8,983,000
Total, John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts.....	19,306,000	19,373,000	18,783,000	19,306,000	19,306,000
Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars						
Salaries and expenses.....	8,878,000	10,070,000	5,140,000	6,537,000	5,840,000	-3,038,000
National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities						
National Endowment for the Arts						
Grants and administration.....	133,848,000	143,875,000	82,259,000	88,785,000	82,259,000	-51,587,000
Matching grants.....	28,512,000	28,725,000	17,235,000	21,235,000	17,235,000	-11,277,000
Total, National Endowment for the Arts.....	162,358,000	172,400,000	99,494,000	110,000,000	99,494,000	-62,864,000
National Endowment for the Humanities						
Grants and administration.....	146,131,000	156,087,000	82,489,000	94,000,000	94,000,000	-82,131,000
Matching grants.....	25,913,000	25,913,000	17,025,000	16,000,000	16,000,000	-9,913,000
Total, National Endowment for the Humanities.....	172,044,000	182,000,000	99,494,000	110,000,000	110,000,000	-62,044,000
Institute of Museum Services						
Grants and administration.....	28,715,000	29,800,000	21,000,000	21,000,000	21,000,000	-7,715,000
Total, National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities..	363,117,000	384,200,000	219,988,000	241,000,000	230,494,000	-132,823,000
Commission of Fine Arts						
Salaries and expenses.....	834,000	878,000	834,000	834,000	834,000
National Capital Arts and Cultural Affairs						
Grants.....	7,500,000	8,941,000	8,000,000	6,000,000	6,000,000	-1,800,000
Advisory Council on Historic Preservation						
Salaries and expenses.....	2,947,000	3,083,000	3,083,000	2,500,000	2,500,000	-447,000

FY 1996 INTERIOR AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL (H.R. 1977) — continued

	FY 1995 Enacted	FY 1996 Estimate	House	Senate	Conference	Conference compared with enacted
National Capital Planning Commission						
Salary and expenses.....	5,655,000	6,000,000	5,080,000	5,080,000	5,080,000	-565,000
Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission						
Salary and expenses.....	48,000	147,000	48,000	147,000	147,000	+99,000
Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation						
Salary and expenses.....	2,738,000	3,043,000	2,000,000			-2,738,000
Public development.....	4,084,000	2,445,000				-4,084,000
Land acquisition and development fund.....		1,388,000				
Total, Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation.....	6,822,000	6,876,000	2,000,000			-6,822,000
United States Holocaust Memorial Council						
Holocaust Memorial Council.....	26,809,000	26,707,000	26,707,000	26,809,000	26,707,000	+2,088,000
Total, Title II, Related Agencies.....	7,011,333,000	6,961,469,000	5,997,212,000	6,107,062,000	6,116,431,000	-894,902,000
(Timber receipts transfer to general fund, indefinite).....	(-44,788,000)	(-44,548,000)	(-44,548,000)	(-44,548,000)	(-44,548,000)	(+221,000)
(Timber purchaser credits).....	(50,000,000)	(50,000,000)	(50,000,000)	(50,000,000)	(50,000,000)	
TITLE III - GENERAL REDUCTION						
General reduction, Energy conservation.....			-12,798,000			
Grand total:						
New budget (obligational) authority (net).....	13,519,230,000	13,817,404,000	11,984,803,000	12,053,099,000	12,114,636,000	-1,404,594,000
Appropriations.....	(13,549,230,000)	(13,832,204,000)	(12,027,402,000)	(12,083,099,000)	(12,144,836,000)	(-1,404,594,000)
Rescission.....	(-30,000,000)	(-30,000,000)	(-30,000,000)	(-30,000,000)	(-30,000,000)	
Crime trust fund.....		(15,200,000)				
(Timber receipts transfer to general fund, indefinite).....	(-44,788,000)	(-44,548,000)	(-44,548,000)	(-44,548,000)	(-44,548,000)	(+221,000)
(Timber purchaser credits).....	(50,000,000)	(50,000,000)	(50,000,000)	(50,000,000)	(50,000,000)	
(By transfer).....	(107,784,000)	(187,000,000)	(187,000,000)	(187,000,000)	(187,000,000)	(+79,236,000)
TITLE I - DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR						
Bureau of Land Management.....	1,099,005,000	1,156,862,000	1,055,463,000	1,048,335,000	1,050,491,000	-48,514,000
United States Fish and Wildlife Service.....	671,038,000	702,617,000	598,936,000	603,650,000	603,864,000	-87,174,000
National Biological Service.....	182,041,000	172,666,000		145,985,000		-182,041,000
National Park Service.....	1,367,328,000	1,460,122,000	1,261,076,000	1,300,336,000	1,318,337,990	-67,982,000
United States Geological Survey.....	571,462,000	586,966,000	686,944,000	577,503,000	730,503,000	+159,041,000
Minerals Management Service.....	194,621,000	201,240,000	192,686,000	188,806,000	186,434,000	-5,187,000
Bureau of Mines.....	152,427,000	132,507,000	87,000,000	128,007,000	84,000,000	-68,427,000
Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement.....	293,407,000	292,773,000	289,578,000	289,411,000	289,867,000	-23,550,000
Bureau of Indian Affairs.....	1,730,970,000	1,897,941,000	1,882,806,000	1,459,912,000	1,546,412,000	-184,588,000
Territorial and International Affairs.....	121,575,000	94,170,000	81,823,000	63,128,000	90,128,000	-31,449,000
Departmental Offices.....	124,022,000	126,616,000	113,488,000	134,181,000	134,181,000	+10,188,000
Total, Title I - Department of the Interior.....	6,507,667,000	6,866,636,000	6,000,190,000	5,946,037,000	5,996,205,000	-506,892,000
TITLE II - RELATED AGENCIES						
Forest Service.....	2,803,802,000	2,416,539,000	2,103,671,000	2,176,224,000	2,166,579,000	-637,023,000
Department of Energy.....	1,265,667,000	1,416,775,000	1,154,586,000	1,143,569,000	1,179,411,000	-86,476,000
Indian Health Service.....	1,983,082,000	2,069,022,000	1,982,787,000	1,986,800,000	1,981,800,000	-1,282,000
Indian Education.....	81,341,000	84,785,000	52,500,000	54,660,000	52,500,000	-26,841,000
Office of Navajo and Hopi Indian Relocation.....	24,886,000	28,345,000	21,348,000	20,345,000	20,348,000	-4,543,000
Institute of American Indian and Alaska Native Culture and Arts Development.....	11,213,000	19,846,000	5,500,000	5,500,000	5,500,000	-5,713,000
Smithsonian Institution.....	362,706,000	407,460,000	360,375,000	372,662,000	373,092,000	+10,386,000
National Gallery of Art.....	56,918,000	64,481,000	56,815,000	56,229,000	56,286,000	+1,368,000
John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts.....	19,306,000	19,373,000	18,783,000	19,306,000	19,306,000	
Woodrow Wilson International Center for Scholars.....	6,878,000	10,070,000	5,140,000	6,537,000	5,840,000	-3,036,000
National Endowment for the Arts.....	162,356,000	172,400,000	96,484,000	110,000,000	96,484,000	-62,864,000
National Endowment for the Humanities.....	172,044,000	182,000,000	96,484,000	110,000,000	110,000,000	-62,044,000
Institute of Museum Services.....	26,715,000	29,800,000	21,000,000	21,000,000	21,000,000	-7,715,000
Commission of Fine Arts.....	834,000	879,000	834,000	834,000	834,000	
National Capital Arts and Cultural Affairs.....	7,500,000	6,841,000	6,000,000	6,000,000	6,090,000	-1,500,000
Advisory Council on Historic Preservation.....	2,947,000	3,063,000	3,063,000	2,500,000	2,500,000	-447,000
National Capital Planning Commission.....	5,855,000	6,000,000	5,080,000	5,080,000	5,080,000	-565,000
Franklin Delano Roosevelt Memorial Commission.....	48,000	147,000	48,000	147,000	147,000	+99,000
Pennsylvania Avenue Development Corporation.....	6,822,000	6,876,000	2,000,000			-6,822,000
Holocaust Memorial Council.....	26,809,000	26,707,000	26,707,000	26,809,000	26,707,000	+2,088,000
Total, Title II - Related Agencies.....	7,011,333,000	6,961,469,000	5,997,212,000	6,107,062,000	6,116,431,000	-894,902,000
TITLE III - GENERAL REDUCTION						
General reduction, Energy conservation.....			-12,798,000			
Grand total.....	13,519,230,000	13,817,404,000	11,984,803,000	12,053,099,000	12,114,636,000	-1,404,594,000

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MFUME].

(Mr. MFUME asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MFUME. Mr. Speaker, I rise in absolute opposition to this conference report. I urge Members at the conclusions of this debate to soundly defeat it.

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES], the ranking member of this subcommittee.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, 7-weeks ago I offered a motion to recommit this conference report in order to improve this dreadful bill and restore the mining moratorium. Well, the conference committee reconvened. Instead of improving the bill, they made it worse. If my colleagues voted for my motion to recommit the Interior appropriations conference report in September, they must vote for the motion to recommit that I will offer at the appropriate time today for two reasons: one, that the mining moratorium has not met the expectations of the House; and, second, because of what has been, what is being proposed for the Tongass National Forest.

The foreign mining companies will still be able to take hundreds of billions of dollars worth of publicly owned minerals from Federal lands for next to nothing because clear-cutting will increase by almost 40 percent in the Tongass National Forest, because this conference report does nothing to stop the impending rape of the Alaska National Wildlife Refuge for only a few barrels of oil.

I had hoped to offer that amendment in the conference and was prevented from doing so. Specifically, the motion to recommit that will be offered today contains instructions to reinstate a true mining moratorium and strike the provisions that lead to the destruction of the Tongass.

There is simply no defense for why the conferees are presenting the House with this excuse for a mining moratorium. After three votes in this body expressing the importance of a mining patent moratorium, the conferees ignored the will of the House and instead there is created in this conference report a sham mining moratorium.

With respect to the Tongass, the mining moratorium is not the only reason why we should recommit this bill. This conference report contains a legislative rider that would force the Forest Service to adopt alternative P in the Tongass National Forest. Alternative P is a radical forest management plan that has been rejected by the Forest Service and by the Governor of Alaska because it would wreak ecological havoc on the Tongass.

What is more, this conference report contains sufficiency language, sufficiency language which is a rider that prevents all environmental laws from

being enforced in the Tongass. The Endangered Species Act is dismissed. The National Environmental Policy Act is waived. The Clean Water Act is ignored. All other applicable laws are considered irrelevant. In addition, this sufficiency language prevents all citizens, environmentalists, private landowners from exercising their rights to sue the Federal Government.

If we vote for this motion to recommit, the conference committee will be enabled to again consider making this an acceptable bill.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG].

(Mr. YOUNG of Alaska asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, I would like to bring to the attention of my colleagues the so-called Tongass amendment. It disturbs me when I hear my friend, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES], speak about the Tongass because you have to understand what the Tongass amendment does.

First, you have to also understand what the Tongass is. The Tongass Forest is a forest of 17 million acres of land, 17 million acres of land, I hope all of my colleagues listen to this, 7 million acres of wilderness already set aside by this Congress; 8.3 million acres in fact is not suitable for timber harvest. We have now 1.7 million acres of land that could be available for harvesting. And because of the action of the Forest Service under this administration, it has taken 585,000 acres out of the remaining 1.7 million acres and made it not available, contrary to the action of this Congress.

I am going to suggest that the Tongass amendment does nothing to change the present law. This is in fact what was recommended by the Forest Service. What was previously said about exempting the Endangered Species Act is not true. What was said about cutting the rain forest is not true.

We have, as I said, over 7 million acres already set aside by this Congress of old growth preservation and wildlife habitat. Now we have the administration coming down and saying by the Undersecretary that we must set this aside for old growth preservation and wildlife habitat. If that is the case, then what are we doing with the 7-odd-million acres; did we make a mistake there? If so, then let us reopen that.

What we have done under this amendment that has been proposed by the Senator from my State is in fact set forth the original concept of the Forest Service itself. This is the Forest Service plan that was signed off by the Forest Service prior to this administration.

I can tell Members this. We have closed over 300 mills in the northern part of this great Nation of ours in California, Washington, and Oregon. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. DICKS] will recognize that, because of

the Pacific pact. It is time to understand that this amendment offered by the other body is an amendment that creates jobs, still maintains the rain forest, the 7-odd-million acres. And those that suggest recommitment are in fact falling prey to those environmental groups that do not want Americans working, that would rather have Americans sitting idle and not harvesting those trees. The recommitment act itself is wrong. This is a bill that has been thought out, fought out and worked on. It should be accepted. We should vote "yes" on it.

I ask our Members to consider the history of the Tongass. If they have a question, come ask me.

□ 1630

Let me answer it. Do not read what is being said by certain groups who are not telling the truth. This is nothing new in this body. We have different groups telling flatout, dishonest, supposedly facts. Let us, in fact, have the truth. Vote for this bill, and vote against the motion to recommit.

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2½ minutes.

Mr. Speaker, here we go again.

The first time the Republican leadership brought this conference report to the floor, the House did the right thing—we rejected the bill, and told the conferees to go back and try again. That was the right thing to do, because that conference report did not deserve to pass.

Sadly, the Republican leadership still hasn't tried very hard to improve it—and it shows. We should adopt the motion to recommit, and, failing that, we should defeat this conference report.

For starters, the Republican leadership limited the number of things that the conferees could consider. They wouldn't let the conferees try to improve the parts of the bill dealing with native Americans—even though the previous conference report fell woefully short of providing proper funding for the tribal governments and the Bureau of Indian Affairs. In fact, the Republican leadership wouldn't let the conferees try to improve any of the funding provisions in the previous conference report, or any of the antienvironmental riders, like the ban on new listings under the Endangered Species Act.

Instead, the Republican leadership allowed the conferees to consider just four things. Those four were: mining; the Mojave National Preserve; the Tongass National Forest; and the National Endowments for the Arts and the Humanities.

So, what did the conferees do about those?

First, about mining: When it sent the bill back to conference the House told the conferees to include a moratorium on bargain-basement sales of the gold, silver, and other hardrock minerals on public lands—a moratorium like the one that was in the House version of the bill. But that isn't what happened.

Instead, this new conference report contains something that's called a moratorium—but that, in fact, will speed up, not slow down, these sales. This so-called moratorium will not apply to applications filed before September 30 of this year, and it will only last until the Republican leadership can get Congress to pass something—anything, except a reconciliation bill—that would revise the obsolete Mining Law of 1872. Then the moratorium would end, even if that bill were vetoed by the President. Meanwhile, this so-called moratorium will actually require the Interior Department to speed up its processing of patent applications.

That is not a moratorium. It is a sham. It is a shame. We should not accept it.

What about the Mojave National Preserve? Well, on that issue there's no difference between this new conference report and the last one. Instead, there's some report language in the statement of managers that tries to deny that this conference report is a back-door attack on the California Desert Protection Act while at the same time attacking the National Park Service and limiting their plans for managing the Mojave. So, this, too, is no improvement, and it should not be accepted.

What about the Tongass? The previous conference report called for increased timbering, including in areas that the Forest Service wants to put off-limits in order to protect fish and wildlife, and would make permanent some temporary restrictions on protecting habitat that were misguidedly included as part of the rescissions bill. This conference report is exactly the same. The conferees not only didn't remove or improve these unsound provisions, they voted to retain them. We shouldn't accept that.

And regarding the endowments, the conferees voted to adopt the so-called Helms language. That's no improvement, and it should not be accepted.

In short, Mr. Speaker, this second conference report is still a bad bill, and still deserves to be defeated. Congress should not pass it. If it is passed, it should be vetoed, and that veto should be sustained.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 3½ minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the motion to recommit. The motion asks nothing more than that the House stick to its original position, keep the mining moratorium, keep current law on the Tongass. The House position has not yet had a chance to prevail because the House majority conferees, with the exception of the esteemed chairman, have not backed it. We must not let a handful of Members turn the rest of the House into a kind of giant Boys' State where we just pretend to legislate. But there are substantive, as well as process, problems with this bill.

On mining, Mr. Speaker, we are being asked to trade a solid moratorium for

reconciliation language which few Members have seen. It is a "Let's Make a Deal" situation. We can take what we have or trade it for whatever is behind door No. 1, and, by the way those who have opened up door No. 1, who have seen the reconciliation language, describe it as sham reform, hardly meaningful reform as the chairman seeks, a continuing giveaway of our resources. How can we look the taxpayers in the face and explain why large, often foreign, companies should continue to reap profits from Federal resources while paying next to nothing?

Now I know some Members have been told, "Don't worry about it, we'll fix it after the vote." That is no way to make policy. We were told it would be taken care of in this reconciliation conference, but it was not.

The question of the Tongass is simpler. We have not acted on it in this body. The other body added a provision that will allow more logging in ecologically sensitive areas at a hemorrhaging loss to the taxpayer. The Governor of Alaska opposes this language, sportsmen's associations oppose this language, environmentalists oppose this language. As a matter of fact, Governor Knowles of Alaska has repeatedly stressed, and this is his language, the need for a balanced process based on good science, the application of sound management principles, and input from the public. We have such a vehicle; it is called the Tongass land management plan.

The Governor goes on to say, and these are his words, the Governor of Alaska, "Killing the Tongass land management process and leaving Alaskans out of the decision is just plain wrong." That is the Governor of Alaska speaking.

Mr. Speaker, the only reason this language is in here, and once again let me repeat, the House has not acted on this. It was added in the Senate. The only reason it is in here is that a few Members in the other body are trying to force the issue. There is no reason to give in. This report takes the unprecedented step of imposing a forest management plan over the objections of scientists and insulates that plan from all legal challenges. In other words, it suspends current environmental law just as surely as the EPA riders did.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to stick to the House position, as we did when a similar conference report came before us in September. Vote for the environment, vote for the taxpayers, vote to recommit.

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER], the ranking member of the Committee on Resources.

(Mr. MILLER of California asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. SKAGGS] for yielding this time to me, and I want to thank the

gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT] for his remarks he just made because I think he outlined very clearly the issue that confronts us both in mining and Tongass. In Tongass we are presented with a radical change from established plan that was passed by both Houses of the Congress and signed by the President of the United States for the management of our largest national forests and our only temperate rain forest in the United States.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I only have 2 minutes. I am sorry; I only have 2 minutes.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I just want to make sure the gentleman sticks to the facts.

Mr. MILLER of California. The gentleman will not impugn my remarks in that way at all. The gentleman from Alaska [Mr. YOUNG] does not have the time, and he has no right to do that to this Member.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCINNIS). The gentleman from California will suspend.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, that should not be done.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair advises the gentleman from California that the gentleman will suspend.

Mr. MILLER of California. Let the gentleman from Alaska have his own time. The gentleman from Alaska wants to take cheap shots, and he can take them on his own time. The gentleman knows exactly what he did.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from California is out of order.

Gentlemen, all Members need to keep their statements to the RECORD and focused on the issue at hand.

The gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER] controls the time.

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker the point is that this legislation, as is presented to us, not only substantially increases the mandated cut for the Tongass Forest, it also increases a mandated hemorrhage of taxpayer dollars from the Treasury. Over the last 3 years we had a cashflow deficit of the Treasury because of the Tongass of \$102 million. We cannot afford to cut these trees in the manner in which they want us to do it under this legislation.

As pointed out by the gentleman from New York and others, the Governor of Alaska has asked us not to do it this way. He has asked us to do it within the confines of the management plan that relies on science, relies on the marketplace, and relies on making sure that the Tongass is preserved.

Now a number of the Republicans who support this recognize that this is unacceptable to the American public, so they started a plan where the Republicans would plant a tree. Mr. Speaker, if all 234 Republicans plant a tree, and we wait 400 years, we will have about 234,000 board feet from the little trees that they planted, but, if we pass this bill, we will cut 100 million

board feet of lumber, more board feet of lumber every year, and 100,000 trees will get cut from the Tongass National Forest, and, as they cut those 100,000 trees, they are going to reach into the taxpayers' pockets in this country and ask us to continue to subsidize forest practices that are mandated, mandated by a couple of Members of Congress that have nothing to do with forest practices, with the ecological health of this rainforest. We should not do that.

Others have spoken about the sham of the mining law reform. It is not a royalty, it is a complete, complete loophole, and not only do they not change the royalty to these companies, but they let those individuals that are in the process now of getting patented claims to escape completely from the royalties, so once again we are going to see the Secretary of the Interior award tens of billions of dollars in minerals, and gold, and platinum, and silver to mining companies, and no return to the taxpayer.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the conference report. While there are many good reasons to oppose this legislation and to expect the President to veto it, there are two issues which are included in the motion to recommit to be offered by Mr. YATES which deserve special recognition.

One offensive provision is the rider added by the Senate to greatly accelerate logging of the Tongass National Forest in Alaska while, at the same time, removing protections for fish and wildlife and insulating the timber barons from the public planning process and legal challenges.

The Tongass rider would suspend environmental and management laws, and would dictate that a discredited 1991 timber plan rule forest management.

This unprecedented congressional action would boost logging of the old-growth forest by 100 million board feet annually, or 44 percent over the historic average. By independent calculation, the Tongass timber program already costs the taxpayers more than any other national forest. GAO concluded that the cash-flow deficit to the Treasury was \$102 million over the last 3 years. To support the increased logging, this Tongass rider could cost another \$18 million in annual subsidies.

The Tongass rider ignores new scientific information and even prevents the Forest Service from setting aside habitat to protect fish and wildlife. It is a solution in search of a problem that doesn't exist, because the economy of southeast Alaska is becoming more diverse. It is opposed by the administration, the Governor of Alaska, and significant user groups who depend on the forest resources, including the Alaska Outdoor Council.

Recently, the Republican leadership circulated a memo advising that Members could enjoy excellent media opportunities and show their environmental credentials by planting trees in their districts. The same Republican leadership has allowed the Tongass rider to be included in this conference report, demonstrating that this advice is nothing more than a gimmick to cover up their antienvironmental agenda here in Congress.

Well, the American people should not be fooled by this kind of trickery. If every Republican Member were to follow the leadership's

plot and plant a spruce tree in the Tongass, in about 400 years we could have trees the size of those in the rain forest today. If we wait 400 years and we're lucky, each of the 234 Republican trees could produce about 1,000 board feet, for a total of 234,000 board feet of potential timber.

By contrast, this provision in the conference report would accelerate Tongass logging by 100 million board feet every single year, requiring an annual cut of at least 100,000 majestic old-growth trees.

Another very good reason to reject the conference report is that it contains a sham mining patent moratorium. The House has voted overwhelmingly and repeatedly to end this multibillion-dollar ripoff of mineral-rich public lands. But this bill does not extend the patent moratorium through the entire fiscal year as we have decided in the past. Instead, the patent moratorium disappears if the mining provisions in budget reconciliation become law. It also can vanish simply if the House and Senate pass identical bills but the President does not sign the bill, though the Justice Department has already concluded that this language is unconstitutional.

I doubt more than a handful of Members in this body have even read the mining provisions in reconciliation which are incorporated by reference in this bill. When you do find a copy, what you will learn is that these valuable public lands will continue to be given away for a fraction of their true worth. All a mining conglomerate has to do is pay for the surface value of the land that contains the gold. That is like buying For Knox by paying only for the roof.

The proponents will argue that the taxpayers will get a return from a 5-percent net royalty. But read the fine print. There are so many deductions allowed that this royalty is likely to cost more to administer than it will generate in revenue for the Treasury.

Make no mistake about it. The vote on the motion to recommit is the real vote this year on mining reform. We won't have a chance for a separate vote on the mining provisions in budget reconciliation. We should reject this conference report and send the President the message that only real reform—a true patent moratorium, a real royalty, and an effective abandoned mine cleanup program—are acceptable. To do otherwise is simply to sanction the continuation of a multibillion-dollar ripoff of the public lands.

Mr. Speaker, I could go on and on about the flaws in this conference report. It prevents the National Park Service from implementing the California Desert Protection Act, which we just enacted last Congress. It is cruelly unfair to American Indians who bear a disproportionate amount of the budget cuts in their programs. It fails even to meet the administration's modest request for land and water conservation fund appropriations, despite an \$11.2 billion surplus in that dedicated trust fund.

Mr. Speaker, this conference report is fiscally and environmentally irresponsible. I urge Members to vote for the motion to recommit.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. KOLBE].

(Mr. KOLBE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KOLBE. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the chairman of this sub-

committee for the work he has done on this conference report. This has been very contentious. I serve on this subcommittee; I know it has not been easy.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this conference report and to reject the motion to recommit. I want to focus my remarks on the so-called mining moratorium here. It is a very real moratorium. It is real, and to see why, let us look at the process it establishes for a second.

This moratorium stays in effect unless a balanced budget act, that is, reconciliation language, is enacted into law. That means legislation passed by both Houses and signed by the President. Or, if both the House and the Senate pass identical language in some freestanding bill the moratorium would be lifted. Now that is a significant change from where we were before because it allows those who want the moratorium, and this House has supported their position, to have a great measure of control, of leverage over this process to be sure that the kind of language that we ultimately pass into law works to their satisfaction.

Now let us focus on the substance of the language that we are going to be dealing with in the next couple of days on the balanced budget act; that is, the reconciliation instructions on mineral royalties. I do not agree that it is a sham royalty. I think a 5-percent royalty is a very real royalty. It is up from 3½ percent that we were talking about before. A 5-percent tax on top of the other corporate taxes, sales taxes, and other Federal and State taxes and fees that are paid. And those are not insignificant taxes, I might add. Furthermore, we will require payment at fair market rates on land that is taken to patent in the future, and it will have to pay on top of that the 5-percent royalty. Of course there is a clause in there that does not apply it retroactively to patent claims that are already in process; and it should not be. People that have made the effort to patent land should not be told, "Oh, the rules got changed in the middle of your patent process." There is also a reverter clause so that land would revert to the U.S. Government if its use is changed. That prevents sham patents being taken for mining and then put to some other kind of use. There will be significant increases in rental payments beginning in 1999. Forty percent of the royalties would go to reclamation of mined land, and that is something I think all of us have wanted to see.

□ 1645

In addition to these provisions there are many other reasons why we should support this conference report. One provision that I am the most enthusiastic about is the recreational fee demonstration program, an innovative program to allow the Fish and Wildlife

Service, the Bureau of Land Management, the Park Service, to establish a 1-year pilot program to allow managing agencies to utilize onsite recreational use and access fees. We need to give this kind of flexibility to these agencies for land management.

Mr. Speaker, this is a bill that provides a sound and fiscally conservative blueprint for the continued management of our public lands, and it deserves our support. Vote for it. Defeat the motion to recommit.

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Montana [Mr. WILLIAMS], the Representative at Large.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, the National Endowment for the Arts and the National Endowment for the Humanities have enlivened the lives of Americans. Individual Americans have received wonderful things each year for less than the price of a milkshake. For that price, they have received the last 11 Pulitzer Prize winning plays. The Endowment has funded "Driving Miss Daisy," "Live From Lincoln Center." For the price of that milkshake, we received those two wonderful TV series, the "Civil War," and "Baseball." We preserved the papers of Thomas Jefferson. We got Garrison Keillor's "Prairie Home Companion." We got the Vietnam Wall. Now, this shortsighted bill, a shortsighted Congress cuts those Endowments by 40 percent. It is wrong. It is wrong.

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Oregon [Ms. FURSE].

(Ms. FURSE asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. FURSE. Mr. Speaker, because this bill guts the protection of the Northwest salmon runs, I oppose the conference report and I urge my colleagues to vote no.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my unmitigated opposition to this bill. This bill is so packed with ill-advised cuts that it would take me an hour just to list them all. Let me speak of just one outrage, the treatment of our Nation's sports and commercial fisheries.

First, this bill terminates three vital initiatives to protect fisheries habitat in the Northwest—pacific, inshore, and the Upper Columbia Basin assessment.

Second, this bill drastically slashes funding for land acquisition. If we are serious about protecting private property rights, we must purchase the lands necessary to provide the habitat for fish and wildlife.

And third, this bill terminates all funding for new species listings under the Endangered Species Act. We are simply putting our heads in the sand if we think that stopping agencies from listing species will somehow magically make the species healthy again.

On the west coast, we are struggling to reverse the decline of our world-famous salmon runs. These salmon once contributed more than \$1 billion and 60,000 jobs annually to our regional economy, but, salmon fishing revenues have dropped by 90 percent because of declining populations.

To those of you who think that gutting funding for the ESA or habitat protection or land

acquisition will help the economy, I say go talk to the unemployed fishermen and women in my district, go talk to the bankrupt tackle shop owners in Idaho, go talk to the thousands of recreational fishermen and women in this country who may never be able to catch a salmon in the Pacific Northwest again, go talk to the Native Americans whose culture and religion rely on salmon that will soon no longer exist.

Yes, we need to reduce the deficit. But the priorities in this bill are all wrong. We can do better than this. I urge my colleagues to vote no on this bill.

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia [Mr. RAHALL].

(Mr. RAHALL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in very strong support of the motion of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES] to recommit this bill.

This appropriation bill for the Interior Department has the most tortured and longest history of any appropriation bill I think this body has ever witnessed. I think that tortuous history is well deserving, indeed. That is because the conference committee on this bill has consistently and in a most blatant fashion ignored the majority view of this body on the question of mining claim patents.

As the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA], the subcommittee chairman knows, this body has expressed its opinion quite clearly on mining law patent moratoriums in previous actions on motions to recommit, and on true mining law reform itself in the last Congress, when we passed a bipartisan and in a large measure true mining law reform that even had the support at that time of the current Speaker of this body. That was true reform. We have also voted for a true moratorium, which is not what we are talking about today at all. We are talking about a sham moratorium in this bill today.

There was in place during the last fiscal year a moratorium on the processing and issuance of these patents. In that true reform I referred to in the last Congress, we even ended the patenting process, again, clearly supported by this body.

This moratorium last year was put in place to halt a national scandal involving the Federal Government giving away billions of dollars worth of public lands to mostly foreign-controlled corporations, without the benefit of a royalty and for the sale price of \$2.50 an acre.

The history of recommittal motions on this bill has already been stated many times during this debate. I shall not do that again at this time. But this moratorium, as I say, is a sham moratorium. It is a fraud. It is a mockery. Once again, I repeat, it ignores the views of the majority of this body, Republican and Democrat alike, that the American people deserve better from their Government. They do not deserve

to be ripped off and the mineral wealth of this Nation plundered on the altar of corporate welfare.

Why is the pending mining claim patent language a fraud? First, and we have been through it already, apparently nobody in the conference committee ever heard of the Chadha decision. The pending language would lift the moratorium if minimal provisions relating to patenting are simply passed by both the House and Senate. They do not have to be enacted into law; no, simply passed by both bodies.

Second, the moratorium would be lifted if the sham mining reform provisions that will be part of the budget reconciliation package are enacted into law. That is not true reform.

This bill will most assuredly be vetoed by the President.

So this leaves us with a situation where, in order to lift the moratorium, all that would have to be done would be to pass a one-sentence bill by both the House and Senate, despite the questionable constitutionality of that action.

Too much is at stake here. And the will of the House has simply been ignored too many times on this issue.

This time, once again, I urge my colleagues to stand firm and vote, yes, vote once again, to recommit this conference report with instructions to maintain the fiscal year 1995 moratorium language.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Nevada [Mrs. VUCANOVICH], a member of the subcommittee.

Mrs. VUCANOVICH. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA] for bringing this conference report back to the House. I rise in support of this revised conference report. This bill is 10 percent below last year's funding and within our budget allocation.

All of the rhetoric notwithstanding, the mining provisions in this bill are not a "sham." The moratorium on issuing new mining patents is real. So much so, that I had to think twice before I decided I would support this conference report.

Those of us who support responsible mining in our country have moved toward mining law reform. We are willing to negotiate royalties and payment for patented land. How much of a royalty, and how much should be paid for the land—these are issues we will have to negotiate with the administration in budget reconciliation.

On the other hand, those who will vote against the bill are voting for the status quo. The question is whether we want to go forward or not. I, for one, do indeed want to make some progress on mining law reform. I urge my colleagues to reject the motion to recommit and support the conference report.

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York [Mr. NADLER].

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, 1984 has come and gone, but Big Brother is alive

and well. It may seem like tilting at windmills to focus on this bill's restrictions on the content of art that the National Endowment for the Arts may fund, but we must not lose sight of the larger issue. Freedom of expression is the bedrock of our national identity.

This bill prohibits the NEA from funding art " * * * which depicts or describes sexual or excretory activities or organs." Does the definition of "sexual" include kissing or holding hands? Does the prohibition against the depiction of sexual organs bar the works by Michelangelo? This language is probably unconstitutional. It is clearly blatant censorship. The new majority has declared deregulation and decentralization to be at the top of its agenda. I guess those lofty goals had a run-in with the Republican censors.

Along with censorship, the bill reduces NEA funding by 40 percent. When this body established the NEA, it said, " * * * it is necessary and appropriate for the Federal Government to help create and sustain not only a climate encouraging freedom of thought, imagination, and inquiry * * *." Let us not forget that our constituents sent us here to protect their rights, not to clip away at their freedoms.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. NETHERCUTT], a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. NETHERCUTT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time and for his good work on this bill, the fiscal year 1996 Interior appropriations conference report.

As a new Member of Congress from the West—eastern Washington—and as a member of the Interior Subcommittee I have had the opportunity to work closely with those parties with an interest in land-use issues, including the mining patent moratorium.

The conference report before us is a fair agreement that reconciles the interests on all sides of the mining issue.

I would like to remind members that we currently live under the law of the 1872 Mining Act. This law must be reformed, however, it is inappropriate to impose a total moratorium on an appropriations bill because we don't like the law. The law should be and will be reformed outside of the of the appropriations process.

On September 29, the House voted to recommit the Interior conference report with instructions to impose a moratorium on the processing of mining patents. I did not support that motion, however the conference complied with the will of the House and reinstated the moratorium for all new patent applications. And consistent with the language in the bill last year, the conference agreed to grandfather those patent applications already in process. This is a fair agreement.

Before voting on this report, members should know that I am told the other body will not support a conference report that does not grandfather patents that were filed before the moratorium was enacted.

I emphasize again, if this conference report is passed and signed into law, no new mining patent applications will be processed. The will of the House has been met.

I also want to address the issue of logging in the Tongass Forest. The language in this conference report simply directs the Forest Service to proceed with alternative P. It may surprise some to know that alternative P was the Forest Service's own preferred management plan under the Bush administration. This plan will allow a sustainable yield of timber while protecting the environment.

I strongly urge all members to support the Interior conference report. It's a fair agreement and a good bill—vote against the motion to recommit and for the report.

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. VENTO].

(Mr. VENTO asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. VENTO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this conference report and this action of this Congress, which is building on one of the worst environmental records of any Congress in recent history. It is a sad day to come here and to face the types of changes that are being proposed in this bill, and then to have them suggest that our House conferees actually did better in contact with the Senate counterparts in this bill. They certainly did not.

This bill upsets and interjects itself into almost all the professional decisions that have had great, great consideration of the past decade in terms of the environment, which have been debated. Furthermore, in this Congress we have not been given and afforded the opportunity, with all the hours that have been worked, somehow we could not find the time to deliberate and consider these bills on the floor in an open manner so we could debate them. No. What we have been treated to is one closed rule, one closed debate process after another, whether it has been on the rescission bill that dealt with the salvage logging issue, whether it has been in the reconciliation bill that the Republicans have put forth; no opportunity to even vote on some of the provisions on the House floor on these measures, and now in the Interior Appropriation bill and other appropriation bills repeatedly.

The authorizing committees in this Congress have been rendered irrelevant, by and large, in terms of this process. There are but just a few examples. That is what this really is all about, that the American public is not getting the benefit of the debate. The Members cannot work their will on these issues. They are presented with legislation logrolled into one enormous package of environmental changes, of landscape changes, sort of take it or leave it.

We might have a vote today on the mineral patent moratorium; which

surely this bill does not uphold the will of the House in terms of that mining patent moratorium. It does not uphold the will of the House. In fact, beyond that, it goes in and interjects itself into decisions made by professionals, whether it is in the Bureau of Land Management and dealing with the roads in the West, or whether it is the grazing moratorium that is continued in here, on the moratorium on the Endangered Species Act barring the professionals from enforcing the law and doing their jobs.

Of course, it goes beyond that and adopts new policy, timber harvest mandates in Tongass, plus this bill further immunizes the rescission timber salvage process bill in terms of salvage logging that was written into the rescission bill last year. We told you it was bad then, and now we know, as we see it unfold, how really bad these salvage timber provisions are—logging without laws or common sense. This is not forest health, this is not fair. This is not the democratic way. This is not considering policy, basing judgments on issues' merits. It is basically destroying our landscape: Destroying the legacy of future generations.

It is a sad day when this Congress steps forward to begin to write these types of measures into law to be our policy. We are not fulfilling our role as diligent stewards. We are not protecting the natural resources.

This bill is not necessary to deal with the deficit in this country. This will leave an enormous environmental deficit in this country that you will not be able to repair in many, many decades to come. We should defeat this bill and send it back to conference.

□ 1645

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I would just like to make a couple of points. One is that the suggestion that when they went from 3.5 royalty to 5.5-royalty that somehow that is an increase in the royalty, but my colleagues really ought to know that there is almost 3.5 payment of royalty exceptions. That means that you will never really get that 5.5-percent royalty, because the companies will be allowed to deduct almost their entire operations, far beyond what is touted as the Nevada law, so that is a huge loophole.

The gentleman from Washington suggested that this takes us back to plan P on the Tongass National Forest and that was the preferred plan of the Forest Service. The fact is, that plan was never adopted by the Forest Service, and the fact is that since that time, this Congress of the United States passed a bill to better manage that forest, and that was done with Presidential signature.

So there is a lot of suggestions that somehow this is major reform, both in

mining and in forestry, but the fact of the matter is it is not. In mining, almost 300,000 claims that have not even made application for a patent are going to be exempted from a royalty should they ever decide to make an application for a patent. That is a loophole that you can drive the entire U.S. Treasury through.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

(Mr. LIVINGSTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I just want to take this opportunity to commend Chairman REGULA of the subcommittee and all of the staff and Members on both sides who have worked to try to come up with a compromise on this issue.

This has been a very difficult bill, and I realize that my friend, the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOEHLERT], is still not happy with it, and I will tell him that there are people who are pro-mining folks who are not happy with it either, and I suppose that there are always going to be people on both sides that are unhappy with this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to give credit to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. REGULA]. He played the role of Solomon. He divided the baby in half. If people on one side do not like it and people on the other side do not like it, it must be a pretty good compromise, because if it were too far to one side or the other, frankly, there would be no hope that it would pass.

So I urge all of my colleagues to take a look at the progress that has been made in these negotiations. It may not be everything one likes, it may not be everything one has hoped for, but this is a good bill, and in view of what is going on in the current political environment, it is very, very important that the conference report be adopted and passed today, that it will then go over to the Senate, that it be passed, and we can send this bill to the President for his signature or do whatever he wants.

The point is, there are a lot of people in the Park Service and a lot of the other agencies that are covered by this bill who, once this bill becomes law, will not have to worry about furloughs, will not have to worry about their next paycheck; they will get paid because the work of the Government under the Interior appropriations will be law, but only, only if we take this first step toward approving the conference report here today.

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, I am not sure whether the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. LIVINGSTON], the chairman of the full committee, wished to rest on the Biblical allusion that he recently invoked. I think actually the gentleman from Ohio has done better than dividing the baby in half, which would have been, or

course, a mortal act. He has done well, given the restrictions that have been imposed on him.

Mr. Speaker, the problem with this bill is that the gentleman had lousy restrictions to work within. And so we really have decimated so many important programs that even, given his genius at trying to make this into a half-way respectable bill, even the good works of the gentleman from Ohio have not been sufficient to make this worthy of the endorsement of the House, whatever shape the baby may be in at this point.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BOEHLERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the chairman of the full committee is absolutely right. The gentleman from Ohio is probably as respected as any person in this House. That is why this is a very difficult position for those of us in the new majority.

The fact of the matter is, he tried very hard. The fact of the matter is he led this House before in voting to recommit with instructions on the mining section. The fact of the matter is, this House has not spoken previously on Tongass.

Mr. Speaker, I think we should maintain the House position. The House has already spoken. Ninety-one Republicans have done so in terms of the mining permitting section.

Mr. Speaker, it is this bill that will drive the reconciliation process. We can send a strong signal to those people so that they will get the message, so that they will deal with the mining permitting section in a responsible manner.

This issue is not whether or not we will have logging in the Tongass. We have logging now, more than 300 million board-feet per year. The question is whether it should be increased through unprecedented congressional action. In essence, a mandate from Washington, a mandate from Washington that the Governor has told us he does not want.

The motion to recommit is pro-taxpayer at a time when we are all talking about balancing the budget. That is the number one objective. If you vote for this motion to recommit, if we succeed in our mission, then we will bring additional revenue into the Treasury, which will help us in that very demanding, challenging task of balancing the budget. It certainly is pro-environment. All America is watching. They want us to be concerned about sensitive environmental issues.

Mr. Speaker, let me conclude by once again heaping praise on the distinguished gentleman from Ohio. He has done a masterful job, although there are some areas of disagreement. I would urge my colleagues to join me in voting for the motion to recommit so that we can make a pretty good bill even better.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time to close.

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES].

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I have sought this time to join the others in throwing accolades upon the gentleman from Ohio who has done a very fine job with meager offerings. The job could have been better. The job can be better. If we are given the opportunity to again review the work that this committee has done, I believe we can come in with a much better bill.

Mr. SKAGGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, I think we have had an excellent debate on this issue, and certainly my good friend, the ranking member and former Chairman, made the point.

I just want to make sure everybody has all of the correct facts. We have heard this called a sham. Well, the Department of Interior said this: "This amendment language would hold back a rush while Congress passes at least some form of mining law reform legislation."

We have the Secretary of Interior, the Department of Interior saying, this is a good moratorium.

Let me read the moratorium that we put in in conference so that everybody has all of the facts. This is in the law, and they are attempting to send it back. I would say to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. YATES], my good friend, when the gentleman says more, I do not know what more we can do. Because here is what the moratorium language says, and we did this at the direction of Members of this House, including myself:

None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available pursuant to this act shall be obligated or expended to accept or process applications for a patent, for any mining or mill site claim located under the general mining laws, unless legislation to carry out reconciliation instructions pursuant to a concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 1996 is enacted into law and such legislation contains, at a minimum, provisions relating to the patenting of and payment of royalties on such claims or an agreement is approved by the House and Senate in identical form in other legislation containing provisions relating to patents.

Mr. Speaker, it is clear. It says, unless there is mining reform legislation in reconciliation which will have to be passed by a majority of both Houses and signed by the President that, otherwise, the patent moratorium stays in place. This is what this body requested that we do.

I think therefore it is important to understand that we vote "no" to recommit and we vote "yes" on the bill. It accomplishes that goals of budget reduction. It does it without hurting anything. It takes care of the important needs. There is no give-away, it stops the give-away of the mining patents that are presently taking place. As far as the Tongass is concerned, there is no

money to increase the cut despite what has been said out here. The cut will remain at 310, maybe a few thousand extra board feet.

Mr. Speaker, I would point out something else that we did in the conference, and that is we allow the planning to go forward on the Tongass. We allow the Forest Service to continue their planning process and to determine what is the best way long-term to deal with this resource.

Furthermore, it protects the Tongass because it gives the Forest Service the decision as to whether or not there should be additional cutting, because the language says that they can only cut to the maximum extent practicable, and that word practicable is determined by the Forest Service. So I think the control remains in the Forest Service. All the dire things that have been outlined here simply will not happen.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REGULA. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I would inquire of the gentleman, will the gentleman agree with me that the Forest Service should not cut more than 310 million board feet?

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, that is right, and I do not think that there will be more than 310, more than that, because the money is not there, and the Forest Service has the judgment as to what is practicable.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote against the motion to recommit. Vote for the bill. It is a good bill, it is a responsible bill.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in opposition to H.R. 1977, the Department of the Interior and related agencies appropriations bill for fiscal year 1996. Time and again, I have stood on the floor of this House to defend our Nation's modest, but vital investment in cultural, educational and artistic programs. As Chair of the Arts Caucus, I have watched the 104th Congress hammer away at the National Endowment for the Arts and we keep hearing the same ridiculous argument from the other side of the aisle. America can no longer afford to support arts or cultural institutions.

I simply cannot understand the priorities of this Congress when 1 minute we rush to dismantle the NEA, and the next we deliver 20 unnecessary B-2 bombers to the Pentagon, and then we sign away \$7 billion the military didn't even ask for. The other week, several Members here were just ecstatic after passing a budget that will cost Americans billions of dollars in lost revenue and sinks our progress on deficit reduction. As long as the 104th Congress follows these budgetary priorities, no one can convince me that the decimation of the NEA is any kind of economic plan, or that it has anything to do with money.

My colleagues, we have all listened to this debate before, and we should all know this is not about deficit reduction or about what we can afford—this is all about philosophy, plain and simple. How many Government programs can point to an investment of 64 cents a year per taxpayer, which supports over 1.3 million jobs in nonprofit arts, and which yields \$3.4

billion a year in tax revenue? To those who claim that Federal involvement is not needed, I would remind you that a few dollars from the NEA often come first before a museum exhibit, a ballet, an opera or a dance troupe receives any financial commitment from the private sector.

Mr. Speaker, of all the reasons why we should not eliminate the NEA, I cannot think of any one more important than the effect on our children. Throughout America and in all of our districts, the NEA routinely provides minority, at-risk and financially disadvantaged students their first exposure to arts, drama and theater. Thanks to NEA grants, some of our most troubled inner city schools have established innovative programs which emphasize art in teaching math, science and history. If we approve these cuts to the NEA, these and so many other projects in financially-strapped schools will be grounded immediately.

My colleagues, it is clear to me, and should be to all of you: the arts are a vital investment in our economy, our children, and in the future of our nation. There are numerous problems with the Interior appropriations bill, but I would ask each of you to seriously consider your vote today—to realize the message we are sending young people and to think about what legacy we are leaving behind. Don't sacrifice what's left of our Nation's cultural programs. Vote against this measure.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to vote no on this conference report. This conference report rolls back decades of responsible stewardship of our natural resources through shortsighted funding cuts, overturning of existing laws, and abdication of our responsibility to preserve our natural lands for future generations.

Mr. Speaker, since 1872, the mining law has allowed more than 278 billion dollars' worth of gold, silver, and other metals to be taken from public lands in return for minuscule payments, according to the Mineral Policy Center. This conference report allows new patents, now blocked by the moratorium, worth more than \$15.5 billion to follow the same giveaway trail.

This past September, the House voted 277 to 147 to reject this brazen example of corporate welfare and insist on maintaining a true patenting moratorium. The mining provisions contained in this conference report ignore the clear will of the House.

In addition to mining industry giveaways, this conference report contains numerous legislative policy riders which attempt to weaken existing environmental laws. The conference report encourages increased logging in the Tongass National Forest, places a moratorium on listing of endangered species, suspends grazing regulations, and cripples the National Biological Service.

In California, the conference report overturns the establishment of the new Mojave National Park Preserve by denying funding for its transfer to the National Park Service. Just 1 year ago, Congress voted overwhelmingly to establish the Mojave as one of the largest natural preserves. This capped 8 years of debate and compromise and was a significant victory for our natural lands.

Since passage, the Park Service has improved visitor services, resource protection, and law enforcement in the Mojave. Visitation to the California desert has increased significantly and has generated additional revenue in the surrounding communities.

By contrast, the conference report rider would transfer management of the Mojave to the Bureau of Land Management thereby eliminating or jeopardizing visitor services and safety, the processing of hunting, grazing, and mining permits, and the maintenance and protection of valuable park resources.

Mr. Speaker, taken as a whole, this conference report constitutes a massive assault on our natural heritage. It offers unprecedented levels of corporate welfare to the mining industry, encourages clearcutting of our ancient forests, and ignores the future health of both threatened and endangered species and their habitats.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this conference report.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered.

There was no objection.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. YATES

Mr. YATES. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the conference report?

Mr. YATES. I am, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. YATES moves to recommit the conference report on the bill H.R. 1977 to the committee of conference with instructions to the managers on the part of the House to insist on the House position on the amendments of the Senate numbered 108 and 158.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. REGULA. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 230, nays 199, not voting 4, as follows:

[Roll No. 799]

YEAS—230

Abercrombie	Boucher	Coyne
Ackerman	Brewster	Cramer
Andrews	Browder	Danner
Baesler	Brown (CA)	Davis
Baldacci	Brown (FL)	de la Garza
Barcia	Brown (OH)	DeFazio
Barrett (WI)	Bryant (TX)	DeLauro
Bass	Cardin	Dellums
Becerra	Castle	Deutsch
Beilenson	Chabot	Dingell
Bentsen	Chapman	Dixon
Bereuter	Clay	Doggett
Berman	Clayton	Doyle
Bevill	Clement	Durbin
Bilbray	Clyburn	Edwards
Bilirakis	Coleman	Ehlers
Blute	Collins (IL)	Engel
Boehlert	Collins (MI)	English
Bonior	Conyers	Eshoo
Borski	Costello	Evans

Ewing	Klug	Rangel	McKeon	Radanovich	Stump
Farr	LaFalce	Reed	Metcalf	Regula	Talent
Fattah	LaHood	Richardson	Mica	Riggs	Tate
Fazio	Lantos	Rivers	Molinari	Roberts	Tauzin
Filner	Latham	Roemer	Mollohan	Rogers	Taylor (NC)
Flake	Lazio	Rose	Montgomery	Rohrabacher	Thomas
Foglietta	Leach	Roukema	Moorhead	Ros-Lehtinen	Thornberry
Foley	Levin	Roybal-Allard	Murtha	Roth	Tiahrt
Forbes	Lewis (GA)	Rush	Myers	Royce	Trafigant
Ford	Lincoln	Sabo	Myrick	Salmon	Upton
Fox	Lipinski	Sanders	Nethercutt	Scarborough	Vucanovich
Frank (MA)	LoBiondo	Sanford	Neumann	Schaefer	Walker
Franks (CT)	Lofgren	Sawyer	Norwood	Schiff	Walsh
Franks (NJ)	Lowey	Saxton	Nussle	Seastrand	Wamp
Frelinghuysen	Luther	Schroeder	Ortiz	Sensenbrenner	Watts (OK)
Frost	Maloney	Schumer	Orton	Shadegg	Weldon (FL)
Furse	Manton	Scott	Oxley	Shuster	Weller
Gejdenson	Markey	Serrano	Packard	Skeen	White
Gephardt	Martini	Shaw	Parker	Smith (MI)	Whitfield
Geren	Mascara	Shays	Paxon	Smith (TX)	Wicker
Gibbons	Matsui	Sisisky	Petri	Smith (WA)	Wilson
Gilchrest	McCarthy	Skaggs	Pombo	Solomon	Wolf
Gilman	McDermott	Skelton	Porter	Souder	Young (AK)
Gonzalez	McHale	Slaughter	Portman	Spence	Young (FL)
Goodlatte	McKinney	Smith (NJ)	Pryce	Stearns	Zeliff
Gordon	McNulty	Spratt	Quillen	Stenholm	
Goss	Meehan	Stark	Quinn	Stockman	
Green	Meek	Stokes			
Greenwood	Menendez	Studds			
Gutierrez	Meyers	Stupak	Fields (LA)	Tucker	
Hall (OH)	Mfume	Tanner	Houghton	Waldholtz	
Hamilton	Miller (CA)	Taylor (MS)			
Harman	Miller (FL)	Tejeda			
Hastings (FL)	Minge	Thompson			
Hefner	Mink	Thornton			
Hilliard	Moakley	Thurman			
Hinchey	Moran	Torkildsen			
Holden	Morella	Torres			
Horn	Nadler	Torricelli			
Hoyer	Neal	Towns			
Jackson-Lee	Ney	Velazquez			
Jacobs	Oberstar	Vento			
Jefferson	Obey	Visclosky			
Johnson (CT)	Olver	Volkmer			
Johnson (SD)	Owens	Ward			
Johnson, E. B.	Pallone	Waters			
Johnston	Pastor	Watt (NC)			
Kanjorski	Payne (NJ)	Waxman			
Kaptur	Payne (VA)	Weldon (PA)			
Kasich	Pelosi	Williams			
Kelly	Peterson (FL)	Wise			
Kennedy (MA)	Peterson (MN)	Woolsey			
Kennedy (RI)	Pickett	Wyden			
Kennelly	Pomeroy	Wynn			
Kildee	Poshard	Yates			
Klecza	Rahall	Zimmer			
Klink	Ramstad				

NAYS—199

Allard	Crane	Hayes
Archer	Crapo	Hayworth
Armey	Creameans	Hefley
Bachus	Cubin	Heineman
Baker (CA)	Cunningham	Herger
Baker (LA)	Deal	Hilleary
Ballenger	DeLay	Hobson
Barr	Diaz-Balart	Hoekstra
Barrett (NE)	Dickey	Hoke
Bartlett	Dicks	Hostettler
Barton	Dooley	Hunter
Bateman	Doolittle	Hutchinson
Bishop	Dornan	Hyde
Bliley	Dreier	Inglis
Boehner	Duncan	Istook
Bonilla	Dunn	Johnson, Sam
Bono	Ehrlich	Jones
Brownback	Emerson	Kim
Bryant (TN)	Ensign	King
Bunn	Everett	Kingston
Bunning	Fawell	Knollenberg
Burr	Fields (TX)	Kolbe
Burton	Flanagan	Largent
Buyer	Fowler	LaTourette
Callahan	Frisa	Laughlin
Calvert	Funderburk	Lewis (CA)
Camp	Galleghy	Lewis (KY)
Canady	Ganske	Lightfoot
Chambliss	Gekas	Linder
Chenoweth	Gillmor	Livingston
Christensen	Gingrich	Longley
Chrysler	Goodling	Lucas
Clinger	Graham	Manzullo
Coble	Gunderson	Martinez
Coburn	Gutknecht	McCollum
Collins (GA)	Hall (TX)	McCrery
Combest	Hancock	McDade
Condit	Hansen	McHugh
Cooley	Hastert	McInnis
Cox	Hastings (WA)	McIntosh

further business could take us to as late as 10 o'clock this evening.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARMEY. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the majority leader for yielding.

I would just like to ask, as you know, there is considerable discussion about a possible continuing resolution this evening. When might we get the language that the gentleman is talking about so that we have some opportunity to review it before we are asked to debate it?

□ 1745

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, the language we are discussing will be at the Committee on Rules, and they will be taking it up when we go up. Obviously the gentleman will have a keen interest in that, and we would try to make sure that the gentleman has a copy as well as at the Committee on Rules.

Mr. OBEY. Is there any opportunity to get that language before we get up to the Committee on Rules, so we know what it is we are being asked to do in the Committee on Rules?

Mr. ARMEY. We will try to get the gentleman a copy as soon as we have it.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ARMEY. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, could the majority leader advise the rest of the Members what he anticipates for the rest of this week in the way of legislation on the floor?

Mr. ARMEY. I thank the gentleman. We do anticipate we will take up the gift ban and the lobbying reform bills tomorrow. We would expect conference reports, of course, at any time, and do anticipate some conference reports. Then, of course, on Friday we anticipate the House considering the Balanced Budget Act of 1995.

Mr. BONIOR. May I ask the gentleman from Texas if he anticipates the Hefley bill to be brought up with respect to Bosnia?

Mr. ARMEY. I appreciate the point. Yes, it is possible. Members should be advised it is possible that the Hefley bill will be brought up later this week. I cannot give the gentleman any definite information at this time.

Mr. BONIOR. Could the distinguished majority leader tell us what plans he has for the Members on this weekend?

Mr. ARMEY. I thank the gentleman for asking. As the gentleman knows, we would expect to pass the Balanced Budget Act out of the House on Friday. We would send it over to the other body. We would anticipate their action, and we would need to be prepared to act on any alterations they might make.

I am telling Members on my side to be prepared to stay here perhaps Friday night, and perhaps even Saturday. As a matter of fact, I have even cautioned Members that the possibility of

NOT VOTING—4

Fields (LA) Tucker
Houghton Waldholtz

□ 1735

Mr. PACKARD, Mrs. CUBIN and Mr. TIAHRT changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. WYDEN, POMEROY, BERMAN, NEY, SAXTON, PETERSON of Minnesota, SMITH of New Jersey, BILIRAKIS, BASS, TORKILDSEN, DAVIS, EWING, WILLIAMS, and LAHOOD changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the motion to recommit was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid upon the table.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. ARMEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask for this time for the purpose of announcing the schedule.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the time given to me by the Members so that I might be able to advise our Members about the program for the rest of the evening.

Mr. Speaker, in just a moment, we will be asking that the House go into a recess. The recess should last until 6:30 or sometime between 6:30 and 7.

During that time, the Committee on Rules will be meeting. The Members should be prepared for the House to reconvene on additional business between 6:30 and 7. We would be at that point taking up, if there is additional business, we will be taking up an hour's debate on a rule so that the Members should be advised that they should anticipate another vote this evening and perhaps another two or three votes this evening, but that the first vote would be at around 7:30 or thereabouts, assuming we can come back from the recess at 6:30.

We would have an hour's debate time on a rule between now and then. Any